

Endnotes

Chapter 2: Juvenile Dependency

Table 2.1
Children With Abuse Referrals by Allegation and Year
2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Table 2.2
Children With Abuse Referrals by Race/Ethnicity and Year
2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.3
Children With Abuse Referrals by Age and Year
2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Table 2.4
Children With Abuse Referrals by Sex and Year
2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

A row is also included that counts children in referrals without allegations (missing/other), so that the total in each table counts all children listed in referrals. Beginning with 2003 Quarter 3 reports, counts of children with referrals are restricted to those with allegations.

Table 2.5
Children, Aged 0-17, With Abuse Referrals, Substantiations, and Percent Substantiated by
Race/Ethnicity and Age
2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Because of missing age values, referrals and substantiations will not sum to ethnic group or overall totals.

Percent of referrals substantiated was recalculated by CFCC staff.

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables. This table is based on county specific data.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.6
Children, Aged 0-17, With Abuse Referrals, Substantiations, and Percent Substantiated by County
2003-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Because of missing age values, referrals and substantiations subtotals will not sum to total.

Counts of children with one or more referrals by year: children with multiple referrals are characterized by the most severe referral, defined by outcome (outcomes in descending order of severity are substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded, and assessment only) and by abuse type (abuse types in descending order of severity are sexual abuse, physical abuse, severe neglect, general neglect, exploitation, emotional abuse, caretaker absence/incapacity, and at risk but not abused).

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Percent of referrals substantiated was recalculated by CFCC staff.

Table 2.7
Juvenile Dependency Filings and Dispositions
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved October 26, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site. URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 - 2004. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2004.

Dispositions per 100 filings calculated by CFCC staff.

Table 2.8
Juvenile Dependency Filings, Dispositions, and Stage at Disposition by County Court
2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved October 26, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site. URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Stage at disposition refers to whether the petition is disposed before the start of a jurisdictional hearing in which first evidence is presented to the court for a determination of whether there is sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations in the petition. First evidence is when one or more parties or counsel appear and oral arguments, presentations relevant to the proceedings, witness testimony, and/or documents or tangible objects are submitted to the court.

Trinity and Modoc Counties did not report for the year 2004. Fresno County did not report dispositions.

Table 2.9
Original Dependency Filings by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved October 26, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site. URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 - 2004.

Table 2.10
Original Dependency Dispositions by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved October 26, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site. URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 - 2004. Fresno County did not report for the years 2001-2004.

Table 2.11
Subsequent Dependency Filings by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved October 26, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site. URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999, and 2001-2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 - 2004.

Table 2.12
Subsequent Dependency Dispositions by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved October 26, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site. URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001-2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 - 2004. Fresno County did not report dispositions for the years 2001-2004.

Table 2.13
First Entries, Reentries, Exits From Care, and Net Change in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care Population
1998-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

A child can have only one "first entry" to care, but can exit and reenter care numerous times in a given year. "Net change" therefore estimates the overall increase or decrease in the child welfare supervised foster care population for each calendar year.

Net change recalculated by CFCC staff.

Table 2.14
First Entries to Foster Care by Removal Reason and Entry Year
1998-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Neglect includes CWS/CMS categories Severe Neglect, General Neglect, and Caretaker Absence/Incapacity.

Other includes CWS/CMS categories Child's Disability or Handicap, Disrupted Adoptive Placement, Emotional Abuse, Exploitation, Law Violation, Relinquishment, Status Offense, and Voluntary Placement.

Table 2.15
First Entries to Foster Care by First Placement Type and Entry Year
1998-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Table 2.16
Median First-Spell Length of Stay in Days by Major Placement Type
Estimated 2000-2002 Entries Combined

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Medians computed with the Kaplan-Meier method.

Mixed placement represents multiple placements where no one type predominated; otherwise, children are characterized by the placement type that accounts for 50 percent or more of their placement time.

Children with a predominant facility type of Guardian or Missing were excluded from these analyses.

Only children aged 0-17 are considered in this analysis.

This report counts all children as being in care until the episode is closed in CWS/CMS. Therefore, the length of stay may be exaggerated, depending on the quality of county data.

The length of stay for children in Los Angeles County with a major facility type of "Shelter" appears to be extremely inflated because of a large number of children incorrectly coded with this facility type. Los Angeles staff has been informed of this issue.

Table 2.17
Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type
January 1, 2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if indicated by the placement change reason of the last placement.

Children who appear to have a signed adoption agreement are removed from all other categories and are coded as being in Preadoptive Foster Care.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Because of small sample sizes, the number of children counted in the Trial Home Visit and Other placement types may be inflated.

Table 2.18
Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Time
In Current Placement Episode, January 1, 2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if indicated by the placement change reason of the last placement.

Children who appear to have a signed adoption agreement are removed from all other categories and are coded as being in Preadoptive Foster Care.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Because of small sample sizes, the number of children counted in the Trial Home Visit and Other placement types may be inflated.

Table 2.19

**Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Time
In Current Placement Episode, January 1, 2005**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if indicated by the placement change reason of the last placement.

Children who appear to have a signed adoption agreement are removed from all other categories and are coded as being in Preadoptive Foster Care.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Because of small sample sizes, the number of children counted in the Trial Home Visit and Other placement types may be inflated.

Table 2.20

**Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care by Supervising County and In-County Placement
January 1, 2002-2004**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

These tables are based on data about children who were placed in Kinship, Foster, Foster Family Agencies (FFA's), or Group Homes on January 1 of 2002, 2003, and 2004. Supervising County refers to the county responsible for the child's case. Placement County refers to the county where the placement facility is physically located.

Table 2.21
Caseload by Service Component Type and Year
January 1, 2000-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Probation and Kin-GAP cases in Los Angeles County are excluded.

Kin-GAP, a program designed to serve children whose dependency cases are dismissed when a relative caretaker assumes legal guardianship, went into effect January 1, 2001.

Table 2.22
Exits at 3, 6, 12, 15, 18, and 24 Months by Placement Type
2002 First Entries to Care

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Only one exit per year per youth was recorded; cases with multiple exits count the most recent exit.

Kin-GAP, a program designed to serve children whose dependency cases are dismissed when a relative caretaker assumes legal guardianship, went into effect January 1, 2001. Thus, an unknown proportion of exits reported in the Kin section may be reported as exiting via Other Guardianship.

Guardian and Missing placement types have been excluded from analysis.

As the quality of data entry may have improved over time, caution should be used in comparing across entry cohorts.

All children are counted as being in care until the episode is closed in CWS/CMS. Therefore, the proportion of children still in care may be overreported, and exits underreported, depending on the quality of county data.

Table 2.23
Outcomes per Year for Children Exiting by Kin/Non-Kin and Placement Type
1998-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Only one exit per year per youth was recorded; cases with multiple exits count the most recent exit.

Kin-GAP, a program designed to serve children whose dependency cases are dismissed when a relative caretaker assumes legal guardianship, went into effect January 1, 2001. Thus, an unknown proportion of exits reported prior to 2001 in the Kin section may be reported as exiting via Other Guardianship.

Children with placement types such as child ran away from placement, other non-CWS agency has jurisdiction, and incarcerated are coded as Other.

Unclear exit type refers to termination reason types coded in CWS/CMS as *Other. This code is not currently valid, and appears to have been used for episodes closed during conversion to the CWS/CMS system with an unclear reason for exit.

Table 2.24

**Reunified and Reentry Cases by Timing of Reentry and Race/Ethnicity
1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 First Entries**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Reentries were tracked for children who entered welfare-supervised foster care for the first time, were in care at least 5 days, and then were reunified within 12 or 24 months.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.25

**Reunified and Reentry Cases by Timing of Reentry and Age at Entry
1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 First Entries**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Reentries were tracked for children who entered welfare-supervised foster care for the first time, were in care at least 5 days, and then were reunified within 12 or 24 months.

Table 2.26

**Reunified and Reentry Cases by Timing of Reentry and Sex
1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 First Entries**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Reentries were tracked for children who entered welfare-supervised foster care for the first time, were in care at least 5 days, and then were reunified within 12 or 24 months.

Table 2.27

**Recurrence of Abuse and Neglect by Race/Ethnicity
From First Substantiated Report in 2002**

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Allegation types of At Risk, Sibling Abused, or Substantial Risk are not included.

Only one substantiated referral per child is used. The selection process used in determining which substantiated referral to use produces a referral base count that is not necessarily equal to the referral counts. This happens because this report examines a referral series by collapsing primary and secondary referrals, while the referral counts look at all referrals as separate observations.

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Table 2.28
Recurrence of Abuse and Neglect by Age
From First Substantiated Report in 2002

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Allegation types of At Risk, Sibling Abused, or Substantial Risk are not included.

Only one substantiated referral per child is used. The selection process used in determining which substantiated referral to use produces a referral base count that is not necessarily equal to the referral counts. This happens because this report examines a referral series by collapsing primary and secondary referrals, while the referral counts look at all referrals as separate observations.

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Table 2.29
Recurrence of Abuse and Neglect by Sex
From First Substantiated Report in 2002

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., & Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Allegation types of At Risk, Sibling Abused, or Substantial Risk are not included.

Only one substantiated referral per child is used. The selection process used in determining which substantiated referral to use produces a referral base count that is not necessarily equal to the referral counts. This happens because this report examines a referral series by collapsing primary and secondary referrals, while the referral counts look at all referrals as separate observations.

County-specific tables count each child once per year in that county, so that a child with referrals in more than one county will appear in the tables for each county where a referral took place. Therefore, the sum of the children in each county table will add up to more than the total in the statewide tables.

Table 2.30
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Race/Ethnicity
July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL:
<http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

Los Angeles County has 42 unspecified cases that were included in the total for that county and the overall total.

The Asian/Pacific Islander column includes those of Filipino, Chinese, Cambodian, Samoan, Asian Indian, Laotian, Vietnamese, Japanese, Korean, Hawaiian, Guamanian, and other Asian or Pacific Islander ethnic origins.

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

Table 2.31
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Asian/Pacific Islander Ethnicity
July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL:
<http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

The Other Asian or Pacific Islander column includes those of Japanese (37 recipients), Korean (75 recipients), Hawaiian (40 recipients), Guamanian (29 recipients), and the original Other Asian or Pacific Islander category supplied by the California Department of Social Services (352 recipients not delineated by ethnicity).

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

Table 2.32
Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Primary Language Spoken
July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the

July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL:

<http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

According to the California Department of Social Services, the data in the Other Non-English Languages column varies by county, with many simply unknown. Languages listed and numbers are not delineated by type of social services recipient:

Alameda: Hindi, Punjabi, Amharic, Dinka, Somali, Tamil, Romanian, and Hawaiian.

Contra Costa: Hindi, Punjabi, Somali, and Amharic.

Fresno: Middle Eastern Indian.

Glenn, Sutter, and Yuba Counties: Punjabi.

Kern: Lyjarati and Hindu.

Kings: Punjabi and Afghan Persian (Dari).

Los Angeles: Amharic, Czech, Gujarati, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, not specified, Punjabi, Rumanian, Serbian, Tigrinya, Yiddish, Yugoslavian, Dutch, German, Greek, Lingala, Lithuanian, Malayo-Polynesian, Navajo, Romany (Gypsy), and Ukrainian. In Foster Care there are 76 "Other Not Specified."

Marin, Monterey, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Sonoma, Tulare, and Yolo Counties: Unknown

Mendocino: Finnish and Hindu.

Merced: Hindi.

Napa: Hindi, Bengali, Punjabi, Urdu, and Hindu.

Orange: Romanian and Farsi.

Placer: Romanian.

Riverside: Bosnian, Croatian, Egyptian, German, Hawaiian, Hindi, Lebanese, Palaun, Pashto, Persian, Punjabi, Romanian, Tausog, Urdu, Visayan, Yugoslavian, and Unknown.

San Mateo: 5 Amharic, 3 Burmese, 1 Dinka, 54 Hindi, 36 Punjabi, 3 Sudanese, 2 Somali, and 3 Urdu.

Santa Barbara: Mixteco.

Santa Clara: Romanian and Hawaiian.

Stanislaus: 259 Assyrian, 8 Afghanistan, 8 Persian, 15 Hindi, 1 Romanian, 19 Punjabi, 2 Fiji, 1 Tonga, 2 Ukranian, and 1 Urdu.

Ventura: Albanian, Croatia, Baao Filipino, Indonesian, 28 Not Identifiable, and Yugoslavian.

The Other Non-English Languages column also includes those of Armenian (13 recipients), Turkish (6 recipients), Hebrew (2 recipients), French (0 recipients), Polish (0 recipients), Russian (24 recipients), Portuguese (2 recipients), Italian (0 recipients), Arabic (7 recipients), Farsi (54 recipients), and the original Other Non-English Languages category supplied by the California Department of Social Services (62 recipients not delineated by language).

For those language categories that were known, the decision to subgroup the language categories provided by the California Department of Social Services was made by CFCC staff and is based on the categorization into Indo-European, Asian and Pacific Islander, and other language groups in the U.S. Census categories of languages, which can be found on the American FactFinder Web site. URL:

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?ds_name=D&geo_id=D&q_1=DEC_2000_SF3_U_QTP16&_lang=en.

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

The Total Asian/Pacific Islander Languages column includes Cantonese, Korean, Tagalog, Mandarin, Cambodian, Hmong, Lao, Vietnamese, Japanese, Ilocana, Mein, other Chinese languages, Samoan, and Thai.

Table 2.33

Annual Recipients of Foster Care by County and Primary Asian/Pacific Islander Language Spoken July 2003

California Department of Social Services, Research and Development Division. *Annual Recipient Reports on CalWORKs, Foster Care (FC), Social Services, Nonassistance Food Stamps (NAFS), Welfare to Work (WTW), Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), and the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) Ethnic Origin and Primary Language*. Retrieved from the Department of Social Services Web site on January 7, 2005, from the July 2003 ABCD 350-Annual Recipient Report. URL:
<http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/abcd350/2002/ABCD350Jul03.xls>

For those language categories that were known, the decision to subgroup the language categories provided by the California Department of Social Services was made by CFCC staff and is based on the categorization into the Asian and Pacific Islander language group in the U.S. Census categories of languages, which can be found on the American FactFinder Web site. URL:
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?ds_name=D&geo_id=D&q_r_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_QTP16&_lang=en.

Other Asian Languages include Japanese (5 recipients), Ilocana (1 recipient), Mein (15 recipients), other Chinese languages (2 recipients), Samoan (6 recipients), and Thai (1 recipient).

Totals computed by CFCC staff.

Table 2.34
Months in Dependency Assignments by Judicial Assignment
2004

California Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC). 2004 CFCC Survey of Judicial Officers—Juvenile Dependency.

Information is based on a mail survey sent to all 121 judicial officers in the fall of 2004 who were pre-screened as having regular dependency assignments. Ninety-eight responses were received. Some topics included in the survey were: background, quality of information at hearings, scheduling, attorney representation, court attendance of parties, intra-county collaboration, and respondent training needs.

More information about judicial background can be found in the publication *Research Update: Background of Judicial Officers in Juvenile Dependency* on the CFCC Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc.

Table 2.35
Type of Experience in Juvenile Court Prior to Judicial Assignment
2004

California Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC). 2004 CFCC Survey of Judicial Officers—Juvenile Dependency.

Information is based on a mail survey sent to all 121 judicial officers in the fall of 2004 who were pre-screened as having regular dependency assignments. Ninety-eight responses were received. Some topics included in the survey were: background, quality of information at hearings, scheduling, attorney representation, court attendance of parties, intra-county collaboration, and respondent training needs.

More information about judicial background can be found in the publication *Research Update: Background of Judicial Officers in Juvenile Dependency* on the CFCC Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc.

Table 2.36
Juvenile Dependency Court Services by County
2005-2006

California CASA Association (Court Appointed Special Advocates). Retrieved October 27, 2005, from California CASA Association Web site, URL: <http://www.californiacasa.org/>; California Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, *California CASA Programs, 2004 Report* (May 2005); and California Administrative Office of the Courts administrative records.

Karuk Tribe of California-Tribal Court CASA is located in Yreka (Siskiyou County) and was added in 2004 to California's CASA programs.

Table 2.37
Attendance at Foster and Kinship Care Education Community College
Programs by Program Type, Fiscal Years 1998-1999 to 2002-2003

California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). *Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, 2001-2002: Annual Report*. Retrieved July 25, 2003, from the CCCCCO Web site, URL: http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/fostercare/attachments/annual_rpt11_14_01.doc and unpublished draft CCCCCO reports.

Attendance figures are unduplicated participant counts.

Table 2.38
Foster and Kinship Care Education Programs in Community Colleges by County
September 2005

California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). *Foster and Kinship Care Education Program, 2001-2002: Annual Report*. Retrieved July 25, 2003, from the CCCCCO Web site, URL: http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/fostercare/attachments/annual_rpt11_14_01.doc and unpublished draft CCCCCO reports.

Table 2.39
Office of the Ombudsman for Foster Care - Cases, Case Types, and Resolution
May 1, 2001-2003

State of California, Office of the Ombudsman for Foster Care. *Annual Report, May 2001-May 2002 and Update Report and May 2002-2003*. Retrieved October 29, 2004, from the Web site, URL: <http://www.fosteryouthhelp.ca.gov/>